

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,054	11/25/2003	· Sakari Poussa	60279-00069	4194
32294 7590 06/28/2007 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E	
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
•				
•		·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			06/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/720,054	POUSSA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Matthew Heneghan	2134				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 No.	ovember 2003.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 November 2003</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	n-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	, ,,					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/26/07</u> .	5)	аселс Аррисасіоп				

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 have been examined.

Priority

2. The instant application claims priority to Finland Patent Application No. 20031361, filed 22 September 2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The following Information Disclosure Statement in the instant application has been fully considered:

IDS filed 26 February 2007.

Drawings

- 4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.74 because Figure 1, which depicts the system of claims 1-9, lack any reference characters.
- 5. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended

Art Unit: 2134

replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2134

Applicant's specification does not disclose a specific embodiment of the "Internet Protocol Security service means" recited in claim 1 or the "interface means" recited in claim 2. These claims are therefore indefinite.

Claims 3-9 depend from rejected claim 1, and include all the limitations of that claim, thereby rendering those dependent claims indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-6, 8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,636,898 to Ludovici et al.

As per claims 1, 2, 10, and 11, Ludovici discloses the use of a VPN connection manager (the management server) for supervising VPN connections on a communication network according to a VPN Policy Database (see column 8, line 47 to column 9, line 3). The VPN connection manager corresponds with an Internet security service protocol means such as an IKE Server for handling connection requests (see column 9, lines 14-21). These servers are able to handle and respond to user requests

Art Unit: 2134

from end users (clients) (see column 9, lines 4-13), which requires an interface means on the client.

As per claims 3 and 12 commands for deleting and querying connections are supported (see column 8, line 55).

As per claims 4 and 5, Ludovici discloses use of protocols such as PPP (see column 9, line 24), which use sockets and data structures for communications.

As per claim 6, Ludovici uses standard APIs (i.e. libraries) for interfacing (see column 8, lines 52-61)

As per claim 8, there can be other components (clients) (see column 9, line 23) and both IPSec and ISAKMP can be supported simultaneously (see column 9, lines 24 and 40 and column 1, lines 49-52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,636,898 to Ludovici et al.

Art Unit: 2134

Ludovici discloses direct communications between the VPN connection manager and the Internet security service protocol means (see column 9,lines 39-46), but does not disclose the use of a direct connection via a LAN for this connection.

Official notice is given that it is well-known to use out-of-band LANs for management traffic, in order to prevent interlopers from being able to monitor it.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect the VPN connection manager and the Internet security service protocol means using a direct LAN, connection, in order to prevent interlopers from being able to monitor it.

Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Heneghan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM 4:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand, can be reached at (571) 272-3811.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2134

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-3800

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Matthew Heneghan/

June 20, 2007

Patent Examiner (FSA), USPTO Art Unit 2134